

THE JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21205

Childs ↓

Sat., 24 May
86

Dear Josh;

Thanks much for the Xerox of Haldane's paper. I have sent for the book but interlibrary loans take forever.

It is an eye opener. I really don't understand it. He mentions Garrod on page 2 + says that G's pioneer work "had a very considerable influence both on biochemistry + genetics," and then pays no attention whatever to it in the rest of the paper. It makes you wonder whether he saw its significance. Or was it only that, as he pointed out, you couldn't test the idea because there aren't dozens of alkaptonic men? Whatever else, it's clear that Haldane didn't follow Garrod's progress - clearly he hadn't read his papers or last book - + so didn't see how G. had developed the idea into chemical individuality; which is hardly different from the title of Haldane's paper. So I'm guessing that Garrod is

discounted because he couldn't test his ideas directly, the way the diosophilists + others could,

I should add that I haven't found any references to the anthonyavin work or to Wright's coat color work in Garrod's writng.

Today all this failure to see what the other guy is doing would be difficult.

I have finally obtained a copy of Troland's 1917 paper. No ref. (of course) to G. but no ref. to Troland in Garrod's work either.

Troland did suggest (as you did in your note of 24 Feb) that the "genetic enzymes must be identified with the nucleic acids," and that they were both auto- and hetero-catalytic. Also he thought viruses were auto-catalytic enzymes. Its a very elegant argument & certainly is to be included (as Beadle did) in the list of contributions leading to the one gene - one enzyme idea.

Thanks for your interest.

ye.

Barton

Goldschmidt contributed too. I must look up how,